UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/585,237	7585,237 06/29/2006 Henning Kloss		ARTHP120US	2257	
23623 TUROCY & W	7590 06/22/200 'ATSON, LLP	EXAMINER			
127 Public Squa	are	YANG, ANDREW			
57th Floor, Key CLEVELAND,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			3775		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/22/2009	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/585,237	KLOSS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

5 .,	Examine	Ait 0iiit						
	ANDREW YANG	3775						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED <u>01 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request					
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO								
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	FINOT REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
NOTICE OF APPEAL  On The Netice of Appeal was filed on the Aprilation company.	lionog with 27 CED 44 27 must be	filed within two month	a of the data of					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<del></del>	t minute the data of Clina a baid							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment(s).</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. 🔲 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			_					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	· ·		•					
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.								
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
/Thomas C. Barrett/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3775	/Andrew Yang/							
Supervisory r atent Examiner, Art Offit 3773	Examiner, Art Unit 3775							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In resposne to Applicants' argument that Buttner-Janz fails to disclose edges of the cover and base plate having a declination of the cornes facing each other away from each other, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in the figure provide in the Final Action mailed on 2/2/2009, the Examiner has pointed out the declination. Applicants contend that the edges pointed to are the articulation surface, however, it is still part of the base plate and cover plate and edges are formed. Furthermore, it is irrelevant the declination is not the cause of the plates never coming in contact since all the claim requires is the structure and that the plates do not ever contact, which Butter-Janz discloses.